REMARKS

Claims 1-46 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of September 25, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 16, 31 and 46 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed.

This response is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In section 8, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-9, 12, 15-21, 24-27, 30-38, 40 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Ozzie et al. (US Patent No. 6,640,241). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Ozzie, because Ozzie fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to clarify that a least one communication action of defined communication actions is sent to a far-end party, and in response to the communication action, notifications are sent to target devices that have members belonging to the communication group that has the far-end party as a member. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that Ozzie does not disclose or suggest sending a communication action to a far-end party, and then sending notifications to members belonging to the same communication group as the far-end party in response to the communication action, as recited in claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, Ozzie is directed to a distributed communication system for use on the Internet and, in particular, discloses a communications manager for providing communication services for an activity-based collaboration system. An activity in Ozzie includes a tool for causing generation of deltas, i.e. data change requests, as a response to user interactions. See Ozzie column 3, lines 64-66. Each activity includes one or more tools for initiating deltas responsive to telespace member interactions. As defined by Ozzie, telespace refers to a virtual place where people gather to participate in one or more activities, and where people can share things. See Ozzie column 8, lines 58-68. Ozzie is

directed to maintaining substantially consistent copies of the data related to the telespace at each network-capable device. See Ozzie column 4, lines 56-58. This is accomplished through the use of a communications-manager that causes deltas to be shared among all the network capable devices that participate in the telespace. See Ozzie column 4, lines 41-44.

In Ozzie, users pursue activities of the telespace via a user interface, which interfaces with tools for providing the tools with user requests. Responsive to the requests, the engines change the persistent state of a corresponding data model to reflect the current state. See column 13, lines 25-31. Ozzie provides an example in which a user is playing a game of chess. The user's request to move a chess piece constitutes a change in the data, i.e. a delta. See Ozzie column 13, lines 34-35. The delta reflecting the move of the chess piece is eventually provided to dynamic managers that are responsible for maintaining consistency of executed changes to the data for all members who participate in the chess game telespace. See Ozzie column 14, lines 25-29. In other words, when a participant of a telespace performs some action or function on the telespace that causes a change in the data of the telespace, this change in data is transmitted in the form of a delta to a telespace manager so that the change in data can be communicated to all other members of the telespace. In this manner, the consistency of the data of the telespace is maintained for all users of the telespace.

However, unlike claim 1, Ozzie does not disclose or suggest that notifications are sent to target devices in response to sending at least one communication action to a far-end party, and the target devices are for members that belong to the same communication group as the far-end party. Instead, in Ozzie a user of the telespace performs an action that causes a change in data of the telespace, and then the telespace is updated so that other users of the telespace can view the change of data. This is distinct from defining communication actions associated with a notification method, and sending notifications to a communication group when a defined communication action is sent to a far-end party of the communication group, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Ozzie does not disclose or suggest defining communication actions associated with a notification method, nor sending the communication action directed to a far-end party by the personal communications device is also associated with identifying a communication group of said at least one communication group having the far-end party of the communication action as a member and thereby sending notifications to target devices that have members that belong to the same identified communication group.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is not disclosed or suggested by Ozzie.

Independent claims 16, 31 and 46 contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1, and are rejected for similar reasons as claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claims 16, 31 and 46 are not disclosed or suggested by Ozzie.

The claims depending from the independent claims mentioned above, are also not disclosed or suggested by Ozzie at least in view of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In section 37, on page 9 of the Office Action, claims 10-11, 22-23, 39 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ozzie in view of Toth et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2005/0053068). Claims 10-11, 22-23, 39 and 41-42 all ultimately depend from an independent claim, and therefore are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 45, on page 11 of the Office Action, claims 13-14, 28-29 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ozzie in view of Denman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,170,863). Claims 13-14, 28-29 and 43-44 all ultimately depend from an

independent claim, and therefore are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _27 November 2007_

Keith R. Obert
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS   Attorney for Applicant
    & ADOLPHSON LLP   Registration No. 58,051
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955